| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 10/619,337 | BATLAW, RAJNISH |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Callie E. Shosho | 1714 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u> | |
| (1) <u>Callie E. Shosho</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Tom Moses</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 4 February 2004 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes, provide a brief description: | cant's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| | | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| 15, 18-20 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet | ERAL NATURE OF WHAT | WAS DISCUSSED: |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. T of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. → | he examiner will provide a こっしっくく。 record of the substance o | written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| | | , |
| | | |
| | • | i |
| | | • |
| | | |
| | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican | nt/Applicant's Representativ | /e Signature – if appropriate) |

, 1 t

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Moses. Page 5 of the amendment filed 12/16/03 stated that new claims 11-20 require that the black offset inks be oil-based. While independent claim 11 recited that the offset ink was oil-based, claims 15, 19, and 20 did not. The examiner's amendment was authorized by Mr. Moses so that claims 15, 19, and 20 would each recite the same claim language as claim 11 in order to distinguish the claims from the prior art. Further, the amendment to claim 18 was made in order to ensure proper antecedent basis.